	Case 3:07-cv-03983-JSW	Document 25-3	Filed 10/10/2007	Page 1 of 3
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619.744.2200 Facsimile: 619.744.2201 E-Mail: mhon@duanemorris.  Specially Appearing for Defenda CASINO RESORT, LLC; LAS	com com ants VENETIAN VEGAS SANDS, LL	.C,	
10	and LAS VEGAS SANDS COR	Р.		
11	TAI TETT	e linited seates	S DISTRICT COUR	T
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
13	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
14				
15	JONATHAN BROWNING, INC corporation,	C., a California	Case No.: C 07-39	983 JSW
16 17	v.  VENETIAN CASINO RESORT, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company; LAS VEGAS SANDS,		DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS	
18 19				
20 21	LLC, a Nevada limited liability of VEGAS SANDS CORP., a Neva DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	ada corporation; and		9, 2007
	Defendant.		Complaint Filed: August 2, 2007	
22 23			Judge: Jeffrey S. Courtroom: 2, 1	White
24	Defendants Venetian Casino Resort LLC, Las Vegas Sands LLC, and Las Vegas Sands Corp			
25	(collectively "Defendants"), by and through its counsel, respectfully submit the following objection			
26	to Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion			
27	to Dismiss.			
28				
	DMI\1204689.1 Case No.: C 07-3983 JSV  DEFENDANTS' OBJECTION TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE			

## 

## I. INTRODUCTION

In opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff submitted a request for judicial notice asking this Court to take judicial notice of the facts set forth in a civil complaint filed by the Venetian Casino Resort, LLC against Naked Belly Productions and W. Gregory Catalano on March 26, 2003 in the Northern District of California, Case No. C 03-0130 JL ("The Naked Belly Complaint"). Judicial notice of the facts in the Naked Belly Complaint is improper because judicial notice is limited to adjudicative facts and judicial notice is limited only as to the existence of the Naked Belly Complaint, not as to the truth of any of the allegations contained therein. As such, Plaintiff's request should be denied.

## II. ARGUMENT

The scope of Federal Rule of Evidence, Rule 201 is limited to adjudicative facts. *In re Immune Response Securities Litigation*, 375 F.Supp.2d 983, 996 (S.D. Cal. 2005) ("Courts may only take judicial notice of adjudicative facts that are not subject to reasonable dispute.") A party requesting judicial notice bears the burden of persuading the trial judge that the fact is a proper matter for judicial notice. *In re Tyrone F. Conner Corp.*, *Inc.*, 140 B.R. 771, 781 (Bkrtcy. E.D. Cal. 1992). This is a burden Plaintiff has not met.

A court may take judicial notice of a document filed in another court "not for the truth of the matters asserted in the other litigation, but rather to establish the fact of such litigation and related filing. *See Wyatt v. Terhune*, 315 F.3d 1108, 1114 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). Here, Plaintiff requests that the Court take judicial notice of the truth of the facts contained in the Naked Belly Complaint. Plaintiff's request is not the proper subject for judicial notice. The Court may take judicial notice only as to the existence of the Naked Belly Complaint, not as to the truth of any of the allegations contained therein. *See generally Wyatt v. Terhune, supra*, at 1114. Furthermore, the fact that Defendants' filed a complaint in an unrelated action against different entities more than four years ago is not relevant to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

///

///

## III. **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court deny Plaintiff's Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

Dated: October 10, 2007 **DUANE MORRIS LLP** 

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

/s/ Michelle A. Hon By:

Ray L. Wong Michelle Hon

Specially Appearing for Defendants VENETIAN CASINO RESORT LLC; LAS VEGAS SANDS LLC,

and LAS VEGAS SANDS CORP.

Case No.: C 07-3983 JSW DM1\1204689.1